App. F IX-4

Preserved

1935 (Miscl)

File No. 98-3

Previous References

erial Nos. 1-8

-32-1-5
-29-1-3, 5, 7-12

Letter-References.

30-33 1-6
120-3. 1-5
186-39 1-12
35-[illegible] 1-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 8

Part B for April 1937.

SUBJECT.

Re the Inam Mly grant to the Guruvammadevaru Inam in respect to the resumption of the S. no 87, Kanuru in village Bangalore Hk and levied to the Inam

Messrs Sadasivaiah & 3 others
c/o M Narayan Rao Advocate Bangalore
1356 ff. S. 4-37).

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29-8-36

Rejects the appeal petn & the endorsement
of the land S. no 10 referred to above

Serial No.

Letter No. C 319/33-34 dt. 5-10-1935 from the Muzrai Commissioner stating that it does not seem possible to take any further action, as the Matadhikari of Sri Gurusvamadevaru Mutt Bangalore is stated to be Contending that the offers made to him are inadequate and that a monthly grant of Rs 50/- to the Mutt be given.

X & XI

Z. & H.

2) The land owned & remained is a devadaya Inam. As an exchange for this 5 Acres of dry land in Kothanuranahalli Village, Bangalore Tq., have been selected for the benefit of the Mutt, in case the Matadhikathi does not accept a Cash grant of Rs 157- pm. The Counsel for the Matadhikari has been once for all informed that the above decision is final - (Vide No. 1076/Muz 315.33 dt. 28/11/35) - & it rests with the Matadhikari to accept either the former or the latter.

Now that the land in Kothanuranahalli Village has been acquired for the benefit of the Mutt

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7-35

For disposal of the resumed land cases -
Vide minutes of 18/5/32 of the then Hon'ble Member - para 34 - page 80 of Mem 391-29-12 - The Binny Mills at Bangalore are now prepared to take the land on lease & they are prepared to buy it @ Rs 13 as per 29/40. If approved the M.C. will be asked in consultation with the Concerned authorities to submit a map & suitable proposals for disposal of the said land ——— for orders ———

Govt. ordered that the S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapur village, Bangalore Taluk, which was resumed by Govt., should not be disposed of - till orders of Govt. are passed on the representation of the matt. (Vide letter No. 200 Mem. 391-29-6 dated 24th June 1930). Now that final orders have been passed as regards the representation of the matt in letter no. 1076 Mem. 315-33-6 dated 25th ... 1933, it is a point for orders whether or it is not necessary to take action to dispose of S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapur village.

As regards the land offered

Re land resumed from Sri Gurunanna Devaru Matt
4 14 Bangalore city.

General and Revenue Secretariat | Plg File No. | of 193 | [App F. III—2

Serial No.

in exchange ~~Hath~~ in Kethamaranhalli village, Bangalore Taluk, or the cash grant of Rs 15 offered as an alternate to the matt by way of compensation for S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapur resumed by Govt., no further need be taken owing to the Sri Gurunanna devaru Matt's refusal to accept the compensation. ~~This~~ the matt which is prepared to forego the compensation which it has been offered there is no necessity to compel it to accept it.

~~Rec~~ 22.10.65.

5) As regards S. No 10 of Hanumanthapur village the resumption of which has been ordered by first in Mis order ~~dt~~ 24.7. (Plg W) proposals may perhaps be called for from the Mr. as regards its proposal Vide 1st Member's Minute ~~dt~~ 18.5. at para 34 of the notes in Plng file No 39 729 (3 of the Mathadhikari does not accept the alternate offer made no further action in this direction is necessary as first have made a definite offer.

593

Gen: Secy) 29/9

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13 7 35

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

2775 4/11

First Member

9/11 D/s and

Gs 9/11 M 9/11/11

Letter no 631 of 14.11.35 to the Muzrai Commissioner asking for proposals for the disposal of Re-S. No 10 of Hanumanthapura Village. Bangalore Tk. received

~~to Mysore~~

Letter no C 319/33-34 of 9.9.1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner requesting that 4 acres 27 guntas mentioned in para 2 of the preamble to Govt order of January 35 be altered to 4 acres and 31 guntas.

Govt 15/11

3

Kind reference is invited to D.'s letter no 3-3191/27-28 of 11.2.28 addressed to the M.C. & the latter's letter no 1097/27-28 of 16.3.28 & also letter no 3/9/33-34 of 12.12.1934. In all these the extent of the S.No 10 is noted as 4-25 & this has been adopted in the Govt orders & reports in the P.W.D. Though Mr. S. Krishnaraja, the retd. M.C. in his D-o of 12.5.32 gives the extent now as 4-2-31.

×P ×R ×Q ×T.

It is not known on what basis the proposal

25r

General and Revenue Secretariat — Muz File No. 98 of 1935. — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

alteration is proposed & if the m.c has consulted the Survey depn in the matter. If appd, his attention will be invited to his previous letters refg to above & to say if he has consulted the Survey records in respect of the dep acreage of the 5 No. Rasimudra.

Yes Dog 12/9/36

14) 12.9.36. 15) Issue Dog 12/9/36

TYPING SECTION 1936 REVISED SCTT

4 No 410 of 14.9.36 to the Mysore Commissioner Calling for additional information—

Issue 21/9

5 Letter no C 319/33-34 of 4.12.1936 from the Mysore Commissioner stating that R.S. No 10 of Hanumanthpura Village Bangalore Taluk endorsed to Sri Gurumurthappa Inam Bangalore is reported to be 4 acres and 31 Guntas—

16) The acreage adopted in the preamble of the Govt order no 1071-s/Muz 315-33-5 of 28/1/35 is as per m c/o letter of 12.12.34. Now in the P.C. the m.c proposes

x d acreage

x g

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

6) Re: Acreage of Re 10 Village Bangalore Thandavedu Taluk

Mlg File No. Settlement. 78 of 1936-37

Alienation is suggested after Consulting the Survey Deptt. Subs for cost of the proposed alienation may be accepted] A
vide A.D., Chittoor a Dft G.O. modifying
The proposal may be sanctioned —

A. Please issue a Dft G.O. modifying the terms as recommended by the A.D. for approval, accepted

2
8/1/-

GENERAL SECRETARY. 15 JAN. 1937

For approval.

2
15/1/-

For Secy). 20) Dno

16/1

21) Dno 2
16/1/-

G.O. No 975 — dt 19.1.37 directing that 6 The Collector of Re — S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapuram Village, Bangalore Taluk will be read as 6 acres and 31 Guntas and not 4 acres 2 Guntas —

TYPING SECTION 18 JAN 1937 GENL. & REVENUE DEPTT.

Sent 26/1

Petition of 1.2.1937 from Sadasivaiah and three others residing at Gowripur Hengari Hobli Bangalore Taluk praying

General and Revenue Secretariat | Ms3 File No. 98 of 1935 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

For reasons set forth therein That the entire Sum realised by the Sale of the S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapa Bangalore Taluk belonging to Sri Ganapathi Devaru ought be endowed to the Institution

22) Re: S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapura Village is a devadaya Inam granted for the support of the Mutt - As it is no longer used for agril purposes, it has been resumed by Govt. & 5 acres of land granted to the Mutt in Kothanuru village Tk. (Vide Govt. Nos. 183-8/Inam 243-27-6 dd 29.7.28 & 1071-8/Inam 315-33-5-8 dd 28/1/35 respectively) - The Matadhipathi had Several Reviews petns wherein he prayed for a review of the Govt. order dd 26.7.28 with a request that the said land may be continued to the Mutt or the amount realised by the Sale of the Same be kept as S. D. deposit for the support of the Instn - In all these he has failed

As it is a case of resumption, an equal area of land has been granted to him in exchange -

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—80,000—8 9-36

pray that the same treatment accorded to Thippa Setty mudali and Attaulla Shah Durga lands be given in the case of this Suit. Also In these two cases the lands belonging to them were acquired for a public purpose & the compensation for thereby has been kept at the credit of the concerned Suits. It is urged that the present case viz one of resumption & the grant of exchange land has nothing to do with the case cited.

14 To show that the land in question is a private gift to the mudali, the pltffs have adduced a certain old document purporting to have been written on 22-1-1849 The land described therein cannot be taken to be identical with the Re S. No 10 now resumed It is also seen from the document that this land was once sold by the Swami of the Devasthanam to the ancestors of the pltffs & that later on it was given back to the Swami gratis as a free gift - If it were so it was open to the then Swami to have expressly stated all the above in Counsel's instructions which he had to give before the Inam Settlement Officer

Exhibit no 1 Was given in exchange as the present case

2 29/5/-

Re: Resumption of Re S.No. 10 of Hanumanthapuram Village - Ramasamy Re belonging to Smt. [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 193 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

As matters stand now the land is a devada
Inam grant Vide ✱ 1 & 2 - on page 180 of 18
of the Inam Reg[r] records for ref[ce] &
there are no data known about that it
was a private gift formerly —
The D.C. Ramasamy has in his letter of 15/9/
addressed to the M.C. reported that instead
it cannot be believed that the lands are
the private endowment to the mutt in
question.

2[nd] The Swamy of the mutt had issued
a notice to Govt that he would file a suit
in a proper Court of law - The opinion
expressed by the G.A. in this connection is
found on page 12 of Mem 19-32-S - He
has opined that the threatened suit
may be awaited - No such suit
has so far been filed. The grant
has been settled once for all; exchange
land measuring 5 acres (dry) has already
been allotted to Hathamuramah alias
it is open to the Mahadhipathi to have
the land cultivated for his benefit
the Inam[t]

C.

To

WD 0417—GPE—80,000—8-9-36

Mucg. File No. of 1936-7

Serial No.

26) The petitioners request that the amount realized by the sale of the land, S. No. 10 of Hanumanthapur village, Bangalore Taluk, to the Binny mills may be given to the matt as was done in the cases referred to in para 2 of the petition. S. Nos 8 and 10 of Hanumanthapur were the only lands endowed to the Sri Guruvannadevaru matt before S. No. 10 was resumed by Govt. in G.O. No. 183-6 / Mucg. 273-27-6 dated 24th July 1928. The Inspl Comr. proposed in his letter No. 1097 / 27-8 dated 13th March 1928 that the price realized by the sale of the land to Binny Mills after resuming it should be divided between the matt and the Govt. The request for the grant of the entire amount realized by the sale of the land (S. No 10) of Hanumanthapur is the only new ground put forward by the petitioners for the re-consideration of the orders of Govt. in the matter. The petitioners state that the resources of the matt will be seriously crippled if it does not get adequate compensation for the land.

The request of the petitioners is

R

W

R

928
12.3.37

Re: Gurusiddha Devaru Mutt lands
Bangalore -

General and Revenue Secretariat | MU3 | File No. | of 1936-7 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

that the entries made by the sale of the land to Binny Mills be endorsed on the said Mutt. In this connection reference is invited to G.O. dated 24th July 1928 directing the resumption of Inam S.No 10 granted to the said Mutt of Hanumanthapura Bangalore Taluk, and the grant of land in exchange and an extent of 5 acres 7 dry land in Kethamaranhalli village Bangalore Taluk made for the benefit of the Mutt, and to the minute of the then 2nd Member (Para 4 of the notes on file No 273-27) when it was definitely advised that the said Mutt had no rights to other than agricultural land. The Mutt has been granted 5 acres of land, which could be cultivated for the benefit of the Mutt. It is submitted that the adm. have already approved the modification, and the petitioners will be endorsed if approved that their request cannot be granted

Has already been

29/3/-

(Hodge Gen Secy)

30 MAR 1937
897

28) In perusal with previous refs. The petitioners do not appear to have any locus standi in the matter: because the Mutt failed in its attempts, it would seem that the petitioners are now trying to raise

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417--GPB—30,000—8-9-36

File No. of 193 6-7 | General Se

Serial No.

the same issues over again All these aspects were considered before the Govt ordered the resumption of this Devadaya inam land and the grant in exchange, of agricultural land of about the same extent. There are no grounds to reconsider this order -

As pointed out in the C/note above, it is seen from the Agreement (d. 22nd Jan 1849) filed by the petitioners, that the land mentioned therein, was sold by the then Swami to Nanjappa, the ancestor of the petitioners & that he subsequently re-gifted it to the Swami Even assuming that it is the same land (S.No. 1c) that is described therein, it must be said that the Swami had no authority to sell it, as it was Devadaya inam land.

The petition may be rejected.

First mr;

1/4/37

1 APR. 1937 No. b 346

3) I agree -

2/4

Serial No.	
8	No 1356 dy 5.4-37 to messrs Sadasivaiyer and three others in his atmr that Government see no reason to modify the orders already passed on the subject.

B 14-4-37

14/4

WL 0417--GPB--30,000--6-9-36

File No. of 193 General S

Serial No.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore,...2nd..October.....1935

5/4

N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Muz 98-35-1

H....V....Ramaswami,...Esq...,...M..A.,....B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....General.....*Department.*

SIR,

Re: resumption of S.No.10 of Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, endowed to Sri Guruvanna Devaru Mutt, Bangalore City.

Adverting to Chief Secretary's Memo No.1078/Muz.315-33-6 dated the 28th January 1935 re: the above, I have the honor to forward herewith for the information of Government, a copy of letter No.C3-941/34-35 dated the 3rd August 1935 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, stating that the Mathadhikari has been contending that the alternative proposals made by Government are inadequate and that a monthly grant of R 50/- to the Mutt may be sanctioned and soliciting the favour of instructions in the matter.

2. In the circumstances stated, it does not seem possible to take any further action in the matter.

3. The entire file of vernacular papers is sent.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G Rudrappa

Muzrai Commissioner.

P.— Head-less Head Quarters

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat 16

Dated, Bangalore, 13th November 1935

No. 631 Rev 98-35-2 14

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.C.319/33-34 dated 5th October 1935, I am directed to request you to be so good as to submit at a very early date suitable proposals for the disposal of Resurvey No.10 of Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, ordered to be resumed from Sri Guruvanna Devaru Mutt at the place and to state that if the Matadhikari does not accept the alternative offer made no further action in this direction is necessary since a definite offer has been made to the Head of the Mutt. The records received with your letter under advertence are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mun

File No. 98-38

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 414

No. 631 Encl Reply

To

The M.C.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 14-11-1935

Signed by Mr B Neduntsezhiyan

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending your letter No C3 33- dt 5/10/35, I am directed to request you to be so good as to submit at a very early date suitable proposals for the disposal of R.S. No 10 of Hanumanthapura village Bangalore to be resumed from Sri Guruvanna devaru Mutt at the place & to state that of the Matadhipathi

Make no further action in this
Direction is necessary Since
a definite offer has been made
to the H.O. of the Mint,
the Records received both
from Calcutta and Bombay
are herewith returned

Thanks Etc

2/11/11

for Gen Sec

GS 2/11

Mz 98-35-3

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 258 8 SEP. 1936 MUZRAI BRANCH

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,
Bangalore, 8th September ...193 6.

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

GENERAL 10 SEP. 1936

SIR,

S.No.10 of Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, endowed to Guruvannadevaru Mutt and resumed as per Government Order No.183-6/Muz.378-27-6 dated 24th July 1928.

Adverting to G.O.No.1071-5/ Mz.315-33-5 dated 28th January 1935 sanctioning 5 acres of land in S. No.101 of Nethadaranahalli as Devada Inam to the above Mutt in lieu of the above land resumed, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter No.33-941/34-35 dated 25th August 1936 together with its enclosure, and request that the mutat indicated by the Deputy Commissioner may kindly be ordered to be made

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. V. Ananthaman

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.C3-941/34-35 dated 25-6-36 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolaba District, to the Mukhtiar Commissioner and Collector, Poona.

With reference to G.O.No.1071-5/No.27-C-1 dated 4-7-1936 granting to [illegible] an extent of 5 acres out of S.No.101 of [illegible] village, Pen Taluka, on the payment of assessment leviable to the said land and subject to the conditions specified in G.O.No.1071-5/No.27-C-1 dated 4-7-1936, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter dated 14-6-1936 from the Sub Assistant Collector, Pen, showing that the area of S.No.101 is [illegible] and not 5 acres mentioned in paragraph 3 of the grant of our Government under G.O. No. 27 C. dated January 1936, and to request that in the circumstances explained, the necessary alteration may be made in the said Government Order.

"N.O.I."

M. N. Bramhan.

for Mukhtiar Commissioner

21

No.P2-86/36-37 dated 13/14th August 1936 from the Sub Divisional Officer, Bangalore Sub Division, to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

With reference to Government Order No.10/1-37 R.O.18-36-5 dated 15th January 1935, sanctioning the Mysore Commissioner's recommendation regarding the grant of 5 acres of land out of Gomal T.No.X 161 of Kothanur Hobli in Bangalore Taluk as devadaya inam land to Sri Muruvinnadevara Matt, Bangalore City, in lieu of S.No.10 of Hanbunathpur, formerly a Muzrai land now resumed to Government, I have the honor to state that in the preamble of the Government Order referred to above, the extent of S.No.10 of Hanbunathpur is mentioned as 4 acres 37 guntas instead of 4 acres 31 guntas.

The Muzrai Commissioner, in his confidential D.O. letter No.1866/39-40 dated 18-3-39 to the Financial Secretary to the Government of Mysore, has calculated the value of the land at 13 annas per square yard of the entire extent of 4 acres 31 guntas, the total value being Rs 18,778 in round figures.

It is also seen from the records that S.No.10 of Hanbunathpur measures 4 acres 31 guntas. As I have addressed the Tinny Mill authorities, regarding the price of the land, I think we have to be precise in regard to the extent of land on which we have to recover the price from them.

I, [illegible], [illegible] that the extent mentioned in
[illegible] is correct, and the bill correct.

'Dear'

M N Chandalwar.

[illegible]

OVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF M RE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 14 - 9 - *193*

No. 410

Mog 98-35-4

From

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esquire, M.A.,
General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

K.V. Anantaraman, Esquire, B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. C. 319/33-34 dated the 9th September 1936 requesting that the extent of the Resurvey No. 10 of Hanumanthapur Village in Bangalore Taluk may be altered from 4 acres 27 guntas to 4 acres ~~27~~ 31 guntas, I am directed to invite reference to the Deputy Commissioner's letter No. C. 3-3191/27-28 dated the 11th February 1928 addressed to you and also to your letters to Government Nos. 1097/27-28 dated the 16th March 1928 and No. 319/33-34 dated the 12th December 1934 in all of which the extent of the Resurvey No. 10 in question is shown as 4 acres ~~31~~ 27 guntas. In one letter however, namely, Mr. Hiriannaiya's D.O. Letter of the 12th May 1932, the extent of the Survey Number is given as 4 acres 31 guntas. Before deciding which of these two extents is the correct area of the Survey Number, it appears desirable to consult the department of Land Records on the subject. This may kindly be done now if it has not been done already and the result intimated for further action.

I have the honor to be,
S i r ,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd- Bharayappa

General Secretary to Government.

P.H.

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mis 3

File No. 98-31

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....258.....

No. 410

To

The M.C.

Sir

With reference to your letter No.

C 319/33-34 dt 9.9.36 ~~that the Extract of~~ regarding ~~alteration~~ of the R.S No 10 to ~~4~~ 4 annas each ~~as per view~~ may be altered A 9 to A 4-31 in Bangalore Tk 4 from 4-27

~~I am directed to invite reference~~

I am directed to invite reference to the D.C's letter No C 3-3191/27-28 dt 11.2-28 addressed to your address to your letters ~~Govt~~ nos 1057/27-28 dt 11.3.28 & No 319/33-34 dt 12-12-33 in all of which the content of the R.S No 10 in question is shown as ~~4-31~~ 4 A 9 In one letter however, ~~to the~~ 4 A - 31

~~and to~~

List of enclosures .....

4 Q

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34

namely, Mr Krishnaiya's D.O. letter of 12.5.32, the extent of the Survey Number is given as 4 acres 31 guntas Before deciding as to

to Kodaikanal is

on which

alienation

and to be

good enough to

Survey

regarding

land in

these

to

proposed

you will be pleased to state if the

has been carried

exact extent

,

Is the

the Survey of

it appears

to consult the

ment of Land Reco

on the subject. It

may kindly be d

now if it has n

been done alread

and the result co

mated for furthe

action.

dcs

29/9/36

GENL. SECRETARIAT
549
7 - DEC 1936

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
MUZRAI BRANCH

Bangalore,... 3rd December *....1936.*

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., I.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.... General .... *Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARY.
5 DEC. 1936

SIR,

Re. S.No.10 of Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, endowed to Sri Guruvannadevaru Mutt.

—

Adverting to your letter No.410/Muz.98-35 dated the 14th September 1936, requesting to be informed as to the exact extent of S.No.10 of Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, in consultation with the Superintendent of Land Records in Mysore, I have the honor to state that the latter officer reports that the extent of the said S.No. is 4 acres and 31 guntas, as per details noted in the margin. A copy of the Survey Superintendent's letter No.D.S.306 dated 22-9-1936 is also enclosed.

S.No.	A. G.
10	4 31

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K V Anantaraman

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.D.S.906 dated 22-9-36 from the Superintendent of Land Records Survey and Settlements in Mysore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.319/33-34 dated 17th September 1936 re intimating the exact area of Survey Number 10 of Hanumanthapur village, I have the honor to state that the area of the Re-Survey No.10 is as shown in the margin.

Re-S.No.	Total Extent. A. G.	Kharab. A. G.	Dry. A. G.
10	4 31	0 7	4 24

"C O P Y"

M. N. Ramachar.

For Muzrai Commissioner.

SUBJECT ....

.. ..

....

Diary. No of letter replied to ....

Section Mu3

File No. 98-33

Serial No. 6.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

x 2

Date of issue..... 19 ....1..... 1937

Signed by Sd/- Sadar Hussain

Read— Go no 10 71-57/Mu3 x

315-33-5 dy 28/1/35

Sanctioning the grant of

5 acres of land out of Gomal

S. No 161 of Kethamaranahalli

Bangalore Tk., as inam

to Sri Guruvanna

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Order thereon—~~No.~~ Necessary sanad

drg, recording ~~the~~ grant of

Bangalore Tk, in lieu of S. No 10 of

Kammenahalli Village of

Bangalore Tk.

2) Correspondence

ending with letter no C.

319/33-34 dy 4-12-1936

from the M.C.

and Records

who was consulted in the matter

has reported that the Extent

of Re S. No 10 of Hanumanthapura

Village Bangalore Tq, stated

in the Govt order read

above is 4 acres 31 guntas and not

4 acres 27 guntas as stated in the G.O. read above

~~order~~ and requesting that

necessary alteration may be

made in the said order

order No RD 5 S. of

The Extent of Re. S

No 10 of Anthapura Village,

Bangalore Tq, ~~is~~ would be read as

4 acres 31 guntas

and not 4 acres 27 guntas ~~as stated~~

in the Govt order dt 28/7/35 referred

~~dt 28/7/35 and to said G.O~~

~~dt 28/7/35 and to this~~

~~extent the said order~~

~~is hereby modified accordingly.~~

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

Yours faithfully

for Secretary to Govt.

To

The R.C.

The Commr for Settlement & Land Records

The Asst Commr

The Secy

WD 03602—GPB 23 500—12-7-35

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
739
2 - FEB. 1937
MUZRAI BRANCH

TWO RUPEES

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Muz Review Fee No. 98-35-37

28 W- ORDER No.183-6-MUZ. 273-27-6- dated 24-7-1928.

PETITIONERS:- 1. Sadasiviah bin Rudraradhya.
2. Sivanna bin Rudraradya.
3.Sivalingappa.
4.Linganna.
All residing at Gownipur,
Kengeri Hobly, Bangalore Tq.

3. Linganna
4. Swalingappa

HUMBLE PETITION of petitioners above said most respectfully showeth as follows:-

(1) Government have in their order above referred to directed resumption of Inam land bearing re-survey no.10. at Hanumanthapur, Bangalore Taluk, endowed on the Sri Garuvanna Devaru mutt, on the ground that it cannot be used any longer as agricultural land and that on account of its proximity to the Binny Mills, Ltd., and the latter needing it, the same may be sold to best advantage, to the said company. Government have sanctioned that an equal extent of similar land preferably in Bangalore taluk, be granted to the said mutt in exchange.

(2) The abovesaid resumption was opposed by the Mathadhipathi, Viz: Mahanta Devaru, now in charge of the mutt, to be cancelled but this request was not complied with and petitioners letter to that effect was given to it and that the Binny Mills, Ltd., are pressing it for a large amount.

(3) Petitioners are the son's sons of one Nanjappa bin Sadasivi of Gowripur. This Nanjappa, under document dated 22/1/1849 corresponding to Monday the 12th day M.D. of Pushya of the year Kilaka-gave the land in return to Rudra Devaru, the second swamyji of the Institution, the condition of the grant being that the said mutt do enjoy the income from the land granted on condition that the mathadhipathis generation after generation do perform on the 5th day of M.I. of Magha every year the 'Arâdhana' of the donor's father, the said day being the date of his death, that on the said date the Guru puja etc. do also take - place in accordance with custom and etiquette. The terms of the grant which are reduced formally to writing so long back as 22-1-1849, show that the same were conditions which were annexed to the grant as pre-requisite for its continuance. The original counterpart(ಅವಧಿಪತ್ರ) executed by the swamiji then in charge Viz:. Rudra Devaru is herewith submitted and the document executed by Nanjappa in favour of Rudra Devaru is with the Matadhipathies who it is learnt have left it with Messrs. Sulikere Revanna, Choudri Mallappa, Mandy Rudrappa, Mandi Revanna and Sriniyasiya of Bangalore who were constituted panchayetdars in respect of some pending dispute.

(4) It is thus clear that the land in question belonged to the grand-father of petitioners who retained an interest in the mode of disposal of its produce and its enjoyment.

(5) As a matter of fact a sum of Rs.250/- to Rs.300/- was being realised every year from the land from the tenants who cultivated it for the mutt and

and the produce was wholly applied for the purposes abovesaid, till about five years ago when cultivation was stopped. But, income realized otherwise therefrom during the last said period has been similarly utilized.

(6) It happened that in 1875 when the inam settlement was effected, the land in question was registered as 'Devadaya' and has been declared as such. For certain reasons of his own Mahanta Devarau, the then Swamyji who gave his statement at the time of settlement has omitted to disclose the fact that the land was the property of petitioner's grand-father and that it was granted to the mutt and was being enjoyed under the above said conditions.

(7) Petitioners beg at once to state that it is not their desire now either to question the resumption or to lay claim to the money that the Binny Mills are giving for acquiring this land. Neither do they wish to take for themselves any fraction of the rents that stand to the credit of the mutt as having accrued from this land. They do not desire to undo the charitable endowment effected by their forefathers. Whether or not the inam settlement stands in bar of any such claim that petitioners may make, need therefore not now be considered at all. The settlement however cannot stand in bar of the effectuation of the intentions of the endowment, concerned.

(8) They learn that the heavy sum of money which is going to be realized in the transaction relating to this land with the Binny Mills is to be annexed to the General Muzrai Fund and that the

the institution in question gets a land of a similar extent else where. These petitioners beg respectfully to submit that this is a matter about which they are interested in making certain representations which it is up to them to m a k e.

(9) They are entitled to have the conditions under which the grant was made performed at the mutt and to see that the entire income which accrues from the land or its equivalent is applied for the purposes of the grant. Indeed Government themselves have in their order referred to effectuation of the intention of the endowment. If either at the time of the Inam Settlement or at any other point of time, the instrument of title or the source whence the endowment came or the purpose for which it was intended and made, had been disclosed before the Government, they would hot have passed order in the terms referred to above.

(10) On the other hand there appears to have been a fraddulent and collusive contribution on the part of the mathadhipathies to suppress and conceal the true data with a view apparently to exploit the entire proceeds for themselves and to free themselves from the conditions of the grant.

(11) Throughout the period of this litigation the conditions of the grant have been screened from these petitioners by active fraud and misrepresentations regarding the actual state of affairs are made to them by the mathadipathies.

~~Indeed it is only~~

(12) Petitioners humbly beg to invite reference to proceedings relating to the case of Thippa Setty Mutt and to the case of the Atavalli Sha Darga in the Lal-Bagh Road, Bangalore City. They are instances on all forces where the entire money was allowed to enure to the benefit of the institutions concerned a FORTTHIORI, the ruling apply with greater force to this case.

(13) Petitioners do not even wish unless Government nominate them to represent the management of the fund, though they very shortly desire, in the best interests of the administration of the mutt that Government be pleased to direct that scheme be framed to see to the best and efficient enforcement of the trusts involved.

(14) Petitioners submit that this land represents all that the mutt owns and should it be lost to it, the mutt may not survive long in a condition that may be fit.

(15) The land to be given in exchange even if ten times the area, will never approach anything like the land in question which in its peculiar vicinity to the town has been of immense utility and was fetching nearly Rs.300/- every year.

---: P r a y e r :---

WHEREFORE, petitioners beg that the

the entire sums realized by sale of
the Binny Mills, be endowed on the
and the performance of the conditions
the land was endowed be directed to be do
the usufruct and income therefrom and to pa
such other or other further or necessary or
that may appear fit in the circumstances se
out above.

BANGALORE CITY,
23rd Dec. 1936.

1-2-37

Advocate for petitioners.

Petitioners.

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1936–193 ನೇ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್.

Vs.

ಮ|| ಶಾ|| ಯಂ. ನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್, ಎಂ.ಎ., ಬಿ.ಎಲ್., ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ ಯವರಿಗೆ.

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಖೈರುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಪಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈ ವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಯಾ ಯುಕ್ತ ತೋರುವಂತೆ ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಲೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೀನಿ. ನನಗಾಗಿ ನೀವು ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನಿಂದ ನಿಮಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದ ಬಾಕಿ ಫೀಜಿಗೂ ನಾನು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರ್ಥೇನೆ.

ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು.....193

The Town Press, Bangalore City.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 3rd April 193 7

No. 1356

Mej 88-35-8

ENDORSEMENT.

Messrs. Sadasivaih bin Rudraradhya and three others C/o Mr.M.Narayana Rao, M.A., B.L., Advocate, Balepet, Bangalore.City.

With reference to their petition dated 1st February 1937 in the matter of the resumption of Re.S.No.10 of Hanumanthpur Village, Bangalore Taluk, belonging to Sri Guruvirmadevaru Mutt, Bangalore, and the grant of 5 acres out of S.No.161 of Kethamaranahalli Village, Bangalore Taluk, in exchange for the benefit of the said Mutt, Messrs. Sadasivaiya and three others are informed that Government see no reason to modify the orders already passed on the subject and that their petition is rejected.

By Order,

Shiv Rajan Murthy

for General Secretary to Govt.

9-5

3 Cells

Section (Mun)
File No. 98-35
Serial No. 8

Diary No. of letter replied to . . 7.39 . . . .

No. 135-b

To Messrs Sadasivaiah Rudrarathya & three others C/o Sri M. Narayana Rao B/A B.L Advocate, Kalpet Bangalore City.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 5-4-39

Signed by Mr Safdar Hussain

Ref reference to their petition dated 1-2-39 in the matter of the resumption of R.S No. 10 of Hanumanthpura Village, Dasanapura Hobli, Bangalore Tk., belonging to Sri Gullamaddevamma Mill, Bangalore, and the grant of 5 acres out of S. No. 161 of Kethamaranahalli Village, Bangalore Tk., in exchange for the benefit of the said mutt and Messrs

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

ordered in the Affr Sec

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32